

REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the following remarks.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13-15 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner points out that “recognizes the content of the notes handwritten on the **paper medium**” is only ever mentioned in paragraph [0040] of the originally filed specification, which the medium as stated is to be the medium which the printer can print on, not a medium on which notes are handwritten. For the reasons that follow, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to satisfy the written description requirement, the “claim limitation must be expressly, implicitly, or inherently supported in the originally filed disclosure” (*see* MPEP § 2163). Applicant respectfully notes that Paragraph [0040] of the published specification explicitly states the following: “[a] medium may be a paper medium such as printing paper of the printing device 140 . . . on which letters or graphics or the like can be drawn by means of the pen 230 of the handwriting input device 200. [The] medium may be a paper medium such as printing paper.” Further, paragraph [0043] of the published specification states, “[i]n this case, the sensor board may be constructed so as to detect the position of the pen tip under the condition that for example a

handwritten note is being made on the handwritten note medium using the pen 230.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that the limitation introduced in the amended claims (i.e., “paper medium” on which notes are handwritten) is sufficiently supported by the specification through express disclosure. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,129,934 (“Luman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,598 (“Kashiwagi”). For the reasons that follow, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 706.02(j) provides, “to support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” Further, in *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007), the Supreme Court noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be made explicit. Hence, the key to supporting any rejection under § 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious (*see* MPEP §§ 2141, 2142).

The claimed invention relates to a terminal device, display system, display method, program and recording medium whereby handwritten input information can be accurately reproduced on display means. Referring to the specification by way of example, a terminal device 120 includes, *inter alia*, communication IF means 132 (*see* paragraph [0034] of the published specification). The communication IF means 132 sends and receives background image data or handwritten data with respect to a conference server 102, a display server 104, and other terminal

devices (*see* paragraph [0039] of the published specification). Further, a handwriting input device 200 includes, *inter alia*, a frame 210, a sensor board 220 with a medium on which the background image is drawn, a pen 230, and attribute input means 250 (*see* paragraph [0041] of the published specification). The attribute input means 250 accepts attributes of handwritten notes when the content of the handwritten notes is reproduced (*see* paragraph [0041] of the published specification). Handwritten data is generated from the content of the handwritten notes on the medium, which may be a paper medium (*see* paragraphs [0040]-[0042] of the published specification).

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 13-15 recite, in part, “receiving handwritten data indicating the content of the notes handwritten on a paper medium on which the background image is drawn, the paper medium being placed on a handwritten input device which recognizes the content of notes handwritten on the paper medium.” Applicant respectfully asserts that Luman and Kashiwagi, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least this limitation.

Luman discloses a collaborative markup projection system including a data projector and a plurality of touch-sensitive input/display tablets, the tablets permitting multiple users throughout a room to collaborate in creating a drawing or marking an image (*see* Luman, col. 3 lines 7-10). The system may include a computer input device to provide a preexisting image that multiple users can mark up using the touch-sensitive input/display tablets image (*see* Luman, col. 3 lines 16-18).

Luman’s touch-sensitive input/display tablet enables a user to enter hand drawn markings (markup data) onto images and/or drawings and to display images and/or drawings to the particular user of the touch-sensitive tablet (*see* Luman, col. 4 lines 15-19). Therefore, Luman’s

input/display tablet functions as both an input device whereby users can draw markings onto the touch-sensitive input screen and a display device to display the drawn markings (*see* Luman, col. 6 lines 38-39). This feature of Luman is distinct from the claimed terminal device, whereby handwritten input information can be accurately reproduced on a display.

The terminal device of the claimed invention, unlike Luman's tablet, does not function as an input means, but rather as a receiver (through an external interface) which receives handwritten input data from an external handwritten input device (*see* Fig. 2 and paragraphs [0034]-[0038] of the published specification). Because Luman's tablet is itself an input device, the tablet does not function as a receiver that receives input data sent from an external input device. Accordingly, Luman does not disclose at least the above limitation of independent claims 1 and 13-15.

Kashiwagi relates to a method and apparatus allowing the display of an electronic memo to a document, no matter whether the document is electronic or paper. Kashiwagi, however, does not teach or suggest at least the above limitations of independent claims 1 and 13-15. This is evidenced by the fact that Kashiwagi is relied upon solely as disclosing a "paper medium." More specifically, Kashiwagi only discloses that the memo is directly written to a display device 64 being placed upon a document 52 (*see* col. 10 line 63 to col. 11 line 2 of Kashiwagi). Therefore, Kashiwagi fails to supply that which Luman lacks with respect to independent claims 1 and 13-15.

Applicant notes that, in the present Office Action, the Examiner ruled that Applicant's previous arguments were moot because of a newly cited reference (Kashiwagi), and did not address any of Applicant's substantive arguments. As is evident from the present Office Action, however, Kashiwagi is not relied upon as disclosing any of the limitations that served as the basis

for Applicant's arguments. Although Applicant argued in length against the Examiner's assertions with respect to the disclosures of Luman, the Examiner has relied on Luman in the present Office Action to make identical assertions, without rebutting any of Applicant's arguments. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider and address every argument made herein.


In view of the above, Luman and Kashiwagi, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 13-15. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 13-15 are patentable over Luman and Kashiwagi. By virtue of their dependence, the remaining claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04783/030001).

Dated: August 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By  #45,079
Jonathan P. Osha THOMAS SCHERER
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant